The Strategic Dividend of Chaos: An Analysis of Russian Gains from the 2026 Iran War (Extended Version)

Camille Lepalliec
Department of Political Science
University of Rennes 1, France
Email: wilburvindland@gmail.com

***Abstract*—This article provides a comprehensive analysis of the strategic benefits accruing to the Russian Federation from the 2026 Iran War, grounded in the theoretical framework of the critique of value (*Wertkritik*) and the concept of dissociation (*Wert-Abspaltung*). Moving beyond conventional geopolitical and moralistic readings, it examines how the conflict initiated by US-Israeli strikes against Iran on February 28, 2026, serves as a catalyst for Russian interests across multiple dimensions. The analysis demonstrates that Moscow's gains operate on economic, military-strategic, diplomatic, and ideological levels. Economically, the closure of the Strait of Hormuz and subsequent surge in global energy prices provide a critical windfall to Russia's sanctions-strained budget. Militarily, the diversion of Western, particularly US, military assets and precision munitions to the Middle East alleviates pressure on Russian forces in Ukraine and raises concerns about the sustainability of Western support for Kyiv. Diplomatically, Russia's calculated posture of "strategic hedging"—offering rhetorical support to Iran while avoiding material commitment—positions it as a potential mediator and indispensable power in a destabilized region, simultaneously deepening its influence with Gulf states seeking new security guarantors. Ideologically, the US-led intervention reinforces the Kremlin's narrative of a rules-based order governed by force, validating its own actions in Ukraine and undermining Western moral authority in the Global South. The article concludes that the Iran war, far from being a distraction for Moscow, represents a strategic dividend that enhances Russia's position in its confrontation with the West while exposing the structural contradictions of a global system compelled to destroy in order to regenerate itself. The analysis integrates the philosophical dimensions previously discussed—Hegel's dialectic of truth and falsehood, Schmitt's state of exception, Debord's spectacle—to demonstrate how war functions as the "moment of truth" within a system characterized by systematic falsehood and fetishism.**

***Index Terms*—Iran War, Russia, strategic hedging, energy geopolitics, military diversion, Ukraine conflict, value criticism, dissociation, state of exception, spectacle.**

I. Introduction: War as the Moment of Truth

A. The Event and Its Immediate Aftermath

The coordinated military strikes initiated by the United States and Israel against Iran on February 28, 2026, marked a significant escalation in Middle Eastern tensions. Within hours, the operation—publicly justified by Washington as a response to Iran's alleged pursuit of nuclear weapons and its support for regional proxies—had targeted key military installations, nuclear facilities, and, according to multiple sources, resulted in the death of Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei [1]. Within days, the conflict expanded geometrically: Iranian retaliatory strikes hit US allies in the Gulf, including Qatar, the UAE, and Kuwait [2]; the Strait of Hormuz—a chokepoint for approximately 20-30% of global oil consumption and a significant proportion of liquefied natural gas (LNG) trade—was effectively closed [2], [3]; global energy prices surged dramatically [2], [4]; and the international community braced for a prolonged confrontation with potentially catastrophic regional and global implications [5].

Yet as the conflict entered its second week, a paradoxical outcome began to emerge from the fog of war. Russia, despite being a formal strategic partner of Iran, despite having deepened military-technical cooperation with Tehran over nearly a decade, and despite positioning itself as a counterweight to US influence in the Middle East, appeared to be the conflict's primary beneficiary. This observation, initially confined to specialized analytical circles, has since gained traction across a range of international media. Headlines proclaim that "Russia is the only winner" of the Iran war, that Moscow is receiving an "unexpected gift" from Washington, and that the Kremlin is "reaping strategic dividends" from a conflict it neither started nor controls [6], [7].

B. The Inadequacy of Conventional Frameworks

Standard geopolitical analysis struggles to account for this outcome. Realist approaches, which conceptualize international politics as a zero-sum competition between sovereign states pursuing their national interests, would predict that a war involving Russia's strategic partner should impose costs on Moscow—forcing it to choose between supporting an embattled ally and preserving its relationships with other regional actors. Liberal institutionalist frameworks, which emphasize the role of norms, international law, and cooperative security arrangements, are similarly perplexed: a US-led intervention that bypasses the United Nations Security Council, that ap-

pears to violate the sovereignty of a UN member state, and that destabilizes an entire region, should theoretically undermine the very order these institutions are designed to uphold. Moralistic readings, which dominated Western discourse during the early phases of the Ukraine war, are particularly disoriented. The clear attribution of aggression (Russia in Ukraine, the US/Israel in Iran) complicates the Manichaean narratives that had simplified public understanding of global politics since 2022. As one analysis noted, "The main argument against the Russian aggression in Ukraine so far has been the rude violation of international law and Ukraine's sovereignty. Now we see another state, which is the US, also violating international law" [8].

These analytical failures are not accidental. They stem from what the critique of value tradition identifies as the fetishism of categories: the tendency to treat historically specific social forms—the state, sovereignty, international law, the market—as natural, eternal, and self-subsistent entities, rather than as moments of a total social process characterized by internal contradictions and crisis tendencies. Conventional approaches, whether realist, liberal, or moralistic, remain trapped within the categories they purport to analyze. They cannot grasp the dialectical relationship between war and the social totality, nor can they account for how a single event can simultaneously serve multiple, apparently contradictory functions within that totality.

C. The Philosophical Grounding: Hegel, Schmitt, Debord

To understand why Russia benefits from the Iran war, we must first understand what war reveals. This requires a brief engagement with three thinkers whose work illuminates the relationship between violence, truth, and social order.

Hegel's dialectic, as reformulated by Guy Debord in *The Society of the Spectacle*, provides the starting point. The aphorism "the true is a moment of the false" captures a profound insight: within a social formation characterized by systematic illusion—by the separation of appearance from essence, by the fetishism that presents historical categories as natural facts—truth does not appear as a continuous presence. It erupts as a moment of rupture, as the violent dissolution of the spectacle's coherence. What the spectacle conceals (the real nature of power, the actual dynamics of exploitation, the contingency of social forms) is revealed in those moments when the normal functioning of society breaks down. War is such a moment.

Carl Schmitt's theory of the state of exception (*Ausnahmezustand*) deepens this insight. For Schmitt, sovereignty is not revealed in the routine administration of law, but in the decision that suspends law in the face of existential threat. The sovereign is "he who decides on the exception." The state of exception strips away the normative facade that obscures the bedrock of political life: the friend-enemy distinction, the capacity to demand the sacrifice of life, the raw fact of domination. War, as the most extreme form of exception, reveals the truth of political order—a truth that peaceful normality systematically conceals.

Debord's spectacle names the mode of social organization characteristic of late capitalism, where social relations are mediated by images, where commodities colonize every dimension of life, and where the real movement of society is hidden behind a dazzling array of representations. The spectacle is not mere illusion; it is a "social relation among people, mediated by images." It is the form in which the capitalist mode of production presents itself as natural, eternal, and benevolent. War shatters the spectacle. It replaces carefully crafted images with raw footage of destruction, diplomatic niceties with the naked language of force, moral pronouncements with the visible reality of interests.

From this philosophical vantage point, we can formulate the central thesis of this article: **The 2026 Iran War functions as a "moment of truth" within a global system characterized by systematic falsehood. Russia's gains are not accidental; they result from its capacity to navigate this moment of truth more effectively than its competitors, precisely because its own position has been less dependent on the spectacle's coherence.**

D. Theoretical Framework: Wertkritik and Dissociation

To operationalize this philosophical insight, the article draws upon the critique of value (*Wertkritik*) developed by Robert Kurz, Norbert Trenkle, and Roswitha Scholz, and particularly upon the concept of dissociation (*Wert-Abspaltung*). This framework, elaborated in previous work on the Ukraine war, provides the conceptual tools necessary to analyze the Iran conflict as a manifestation of the structural crisis of late capitalism.

The core propositions of this framework are:

1. **The crisis of valorization**: Capitalism is not simply a system of exploitation or inequality, but a specific social form characterized by the domination of abstract value over concrete wealth. The development of productive forces (automation, digitalization, artificial intelligence) increasingly renders living labor—the sole source of value—redundant, generating a structural tendency toward crisis. The system cannot simply abolish itself; it therefore develops "desperate countertendencies" (*verzweifelte Gegenetendenzen*) that attempt to manage the crisis through destruction and violence.

2. **Accumulation by dispossession**: When the normal expansion of capital through the exploitation of wage labor reaches its limits, capital turns to extra-economic means: privatization, expropriation, and war. David Harvey's concept of "accumulation by dispossession" captures this dynamic. War functions as a privileged mechanism of dispossession, creating new opportunities for accumulation through the destruction and subsequent reconstruction of physical and social infrastructure.

3. **Dissociation (Wert-Abspaltung)**: The sphere of value cannot constitute itself autonomously. It depends upon and exploits a "dissociated" sphere encompassing reproductive labor, nature, affect, and all those dimensions of life that are necessary for social reproduction but that do not directly produce value. War represents the most extreme form of

dissociation: it violently separates populations from territories, destroys ecosystems, shatters social bonds, and creates the "organized chaos" that precedes the subsequent re-integration of these destroyed spheres into the circuit of capital.

4. **Necropolitics**: Achille Mbembe's concept of necropolitics extends Foucault's biopolitics to analyze how sovereign power exercises its capacity to decide who may live and who must die. War is necropolitics par excellence: it sorts populations into categories (those to be protected, those to be sacrificed, those to be displaced), creating zones of exception where the most brutal violence becomes the norm.

5. **Spatio-temporal fixes**: David Harvey's concept of the "spatial fix" describes how capitalism temporarily resolves its crises of overaccumulation through geographical expansion and the accelerated reconstruction of space. War, by destroying existing spatial configurations, creates the precondition for new "fixes"—the colossal reconstruction projects that will absorb surplus capital and generate new rounds of accumulation.

This framework allows us to analyze the Iran war not as a geopolitical accident, but as a moment in the self-reproduction of a crisis-ridden system. Within this broader dynamic, Russia's specific gains can be identified and analyzed.

E. Structure of the Argument

The article proceeds in seven sections. Section II provides essential historical and geopolitical context, tracing Russia's evolving relationship with Iran, its strategic posture in the Middle East, and the specific characteristics of the 2026 crisis. Section III examines the economic dimension of Russian gains, focusing on energy revenues, market realignment, and the strategic manipulation of supply. Section IV analyzes the military-strategic dimension, documenting the diversion of Western assets from Ukraine and the depletion of critical munitions stocks. Section V explores the diplomatic dimension, detailing Russia's posture of "strategic hedging" and its simultaneous cultivation of relationships with Iran, Israel, and the Gulf states. Section VI addresses the ideological dimension, showing how the war validates the Kremlin's worldview, reinforces domestic consolidation, and undermines Western moral authority. Section VII synthesizes these findings within the theoretical framework, demonstrating how the war functions as a "moment of truth" that reveals the real dynamics of power. A concluding section reflects on the longer-term implications for Russia, for the Middle East, and for the global order.

II. Historical and Geopolitical Context: Russia's Middle East Calculus

A. The Evolution of Russian-Iranian Relations (1991–2026)

To understand Russia's position in the 2026 Iran war, it is essential to trace the evolution of its relationship with Tehran over the past three decades. This relationship has never been a simple alliance. It has rather been a complex, layered partnership characterized by cooperation in some domains, competition in others, and a persistent undercurrent of mutual suspicion.

The 1990s: Cautious Engagement. In the immediate aftermath of the Soviet collapse, Russian-Iranian relations were shaped by three factors: Russia's need for revenue (leading to arms sales and nuclear cooperation), Iran's isolation from the West, and their shared interest in containing Taliban-controlled Afghanistan and preventing the disintegration of Tajikistan. The 1995 "Gore-Chernomyrdin" agreement, under which Russia committed to cease conventional arms sales to Iran by 1999, temporarily limited cooperation, but by the late 1990s, Russia was again supplying Iran with conventional weapons and continuing work on the Bushehr nuclear reactor.

The 2000s: Strategic Partnership Deepens. Under Putin, Russia adopted a more assertive posture in the Middle East, seeking to restore influence lost after 1991. Iran emerged as a natural partner. Russia supported Iran's civilian nuclear program (completing Bushehr in 2013 despite international pressure), supplied air defense systems (the Tor-M1 in 2007, and later the S-300, delivery of which was suspended and then resumed), and aligned with Iran on key diplomatic issues, including opposition to unilateral sanctions and support for the Assad regime in Syria. Crucially, however, Russia also maintained relations with Israel and the Gulf states, balancing its Iran policy against other regional interests.

The 2010s: The Syrian Crucible. The Syrian civil war transformed Russian-Iranian cooperation. From 2015 onward, Russia and Iran fought on the same side in support of Bashar al-Assad. This military collaboration, unprecedented in their bilateral history, generated deep operational ties and exposed Russian and Iranian forces to each other's tactics, technologies, and command structures. Yet even here, cooperation was limited. Russia and Iran supported different militias, pursued different post-war visions, and competed for influence within the pro-Assad coalition. Russia's willingness to tolerate Israeli airstrikes against Iranian targets in Syria (provided they did not endanger Russian personnel) was a constant source of Iranian frustration.

The 2020s: Military-Technical Cooperation Intensifies. Following Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, Iranian-Russian military cooperation reached new levels. Iran supplied Russia with hundreds of Shahed-series loitering munitions (drones), which became a signature weapon in Russia's campaign against Ukrainian infrastructure. Reports also indicated Iranian provision of ballistic missiles, though evidence of their use in combat remains limited. In return, Russia provided Iran with advanced air defense systems (the S-400), electronic warfare capabilities, and satellite intelligence [9]. This exchange was mutually beneficial: Russia gained critical strike capabilities to sustain its war effort; Iran gained defense systems that enhanced its ability to deter or withstand Israeli or US attack.

Yet even this intensified cooperation did not amount to an alliance. Throughout 2023–2025, Russia repeatedly declined Iranian proposals for deeper strategic commitments, including a formal mutual defense treaty reportedly offered in January 2025 that would have granted Russia access to the Chabahar naval base on the Indian Ocean [9]. As we shall see, this

refusal to be drawn into a binding commitment was a strategic choice that positioned Russia to benefit from the 2026 crisis.

B. Russia's Strategic Hedging Doctrine

Russia's approach to the Middle East is best understood through the concept of "strategic hedging": maintaining cooperative relationships with multiple, often competing actors to preserve freedom of maneuver and maximize influence, while avoiding binding commitments that would constrain future options [7].

This doctrine manifests in several dimensions:

Balancing Iran and Israel: Russia maintains diplomatic relations and security dialogue with Israel, despite Israel's frequent airstrikes against Iranian targets in Syria. The "deconfliction mechanism" established between Russian and Israeli militaries has allowed Israel to operate in Syrian airspace provided it avoids targeting Russian personnel. This arrangement infuriates Tehran but serves Moscow's interest in preserving its relationship with a key US ally and technologically advanced partner.

Courting the Gulf monarchies: Russia has systematically cultivated ties with Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and Qatar. OPEC+ coordination on oil production gives Russia and Saudi Arabia shared interest in managing global prices. The UAE has become a hub for Russian capital flight and trade since 2022. Qatar, despite hosting the largest US military base in the region, has maintained dialogue with Moscow on energy and regional security issues. These relationships survived the Ukraine war and have intensified in its aftermath.

Engaging Turkey: Despite supporting opposing sides in Syria and Libya, Russia and Turkey have developed a distinctive mode of cooperation-competition, managing conflicts through dialogue and preserving economic ties (including Turkish purchases of Russian gas and, until recently, participation in the TurkStream pipeline project).

This hedging strategy requires constant calibration. Too close an embrace of Iran alienates Israel and the Gulf states; too distant a posture toward Tehran undermines Russia's credibility as a reliable partner. The 2026 Iran war tests this balancing act to its limits—but, as we shall see, the hedging strategy has positioned Russia to navigate the crisis more effectively than its rivals.

C. The February 2026 Crisis: A Chronology

The immediate trigger for the 2026 war lies in a series of escalations during late 2025 and early 2026:

- **November 2025**: The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) releases a highly critical report on Iran's nuclear program, citing previously undisclosed activities at several sites and expressing "serious concerns" about possible weapons-related research.

- **December 2025–January 2026**: Israeli officials, including Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, intensify rhetoric regarding Iran's nuclear program, stating that "all options are on the table" and that Israel will not tolerate a nuclear-armed Iran.

- **February 15, 2026**: The United States announces a significant reinforcement of its military presence in the Gulf, including the deployment of an additional aircraft carrier strike group and the repositioning of B-52 bombers to the region.

- **February 28, 2026**: Coordinated US-Israeli strikes begin against Iranian targets. Initial reports indicate strikes on nuclear facilities at Natanz and Fordow, military command centers in Tehran and other cities, and, critically, the compound where Supreme Leader Khamenei is located. Within hours, Iranian state media confirms Khamenei's death [1].

- **March 1–2, 2026**: Iran launches retaliatory strikes against US allies in the Gulf, including Qatar, the UAE, and Kuwait. The Strait of Hormuz is effectively closed to shipping. Iran announces suspension of all oil and gas exports and threatens to target any vessel attempting to transit the Strait without Iranian authorization [2].

- **March 3–4, 2026**: Global energy prices surge. European gas prices jump over 30%, oil prices rise sharply. The United Nations Security Council meets in emergency session but fails to reach consensus, with Russia and China blocking any resolution that would endorse the strikes.

- **March 5, 2026**: Putin holds phone calls with leaders of the UAE, Bahrain, and Qatar, offering Russian mediation and condemning the strikes as a "cynical violation of international law." Simultaneously, Russia announces it will continue all existing energy contracts and stands ready to "stabilize global markets" [5].

It is within this rapidly evolving context that we must analyze Russia's gains.

III. The Economic Dimension: Oil, Sanctions, and Market Realignment

The most immediate and quantifiable benefits accruing to Russia from the Iran war are economic. As a hydrocarbon-exporting economy whose fiscal health remains heavily dependent on energy revenues despite years of diversification efforts, Russia is uniquely positioned to profit from the disruption of global energy markets. This section analyzes the mechanisms through which the conflict generates economic gains for Moscow, the structural factors that amplify these gains, and the strategic options they create for the Kremlin.

A. The Mechanics of the Price Surge

The closure of the Strait of Hormuz following Iranian retaliatory strikes represents a supply shock of historic proportions. Approximately 20–30% of global oil consumption—roughly 20 million barrels per day—transits this chokepoint [2], [3]. The Strait is equally critical for liquefied natural gas (LNG): Qatar, the world's largest LNG exporter, ships virtually all its production through Hormuz. Iran's March 2 announcement suspending its own exports and threatening military action against any vessel attempting unauthorized transit effectively removed a significant portion of global supply from the market.

The price response was immediate and dramatic. Brent crude, the global benchmark, rose from approximately $72

per barrel on the eve of the strikes to over $82 per barrel by March 4—a 14% increase in four days [3]. European natural gas prices, already elevated due to the ongoing energy crisis triggered by the Ukraine war, surged more than 30%, with the Dutch TTF futures contract reaching its highest level since the winter of 2022–2023 [4].

For Russia, however, the critical metric is not Brent but Urals—the blend of Russian crude that has, since the imposition of Western sanctions in 2022–2023, traded at a significant discount. In late February 2026, Urals had plunged to approximately $40 per barrel, reflecting the cumulative impact of the EU embargo, the G7 price cap, and reduced demand from traditional buyers [3], [4]. By March 5, Urals had rebounded to approximately $62 per barrel—a 55% increase in less than a week [4].

This price level is critically important for Russian fiscal stability. Russia's 2026 federal budget, adopted in late 2025, was predicated on an average Urals price of $59 per barrel [4]. Every dollar above this benchmark generates approximately $1.5–2 billion in additional annual revenue, given Russia's export volumes. The current price level therefore produces an immediate fiscal windfall, easing the pressures created by four years of war-related expenditure and Western sanctions.

B. Structural Factors Amplifying Russian Gains

The price surge alone would benefit Russia. However, several structural factors amplify these gains and create advantages that extend beyond the simple price effect.

1) The Elimination of a Key Competitor: Iran is not merely another oil exporter. It is the world's ninth-largest oil producer and holds the third-largest proven natural gas reserves globally. Critically, Iran, like Russia, has been subject to extensive Western sanctions since 2018, following the US withdrawal from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). This shared experience of sanctions created a natural affinity between the two producers, but also positioned them as competitors for the same markets—particularly China and India, the primary destinations for both Russian and Iranian crude.

The effective suspension of Iranian exports removes this competitor from the market. Chinese and Indian refiners, who had been purchasing significant volumes of discounted Iranian oil, must now seek alternative supplies. Russian oil, despite still trading at a discount relative to Brent, becomes the natural substitute. This dynamic was immediately visible in market responses: within days of the Hormuz closure, Indian refiners began inquiring about increased Russian deliveries, and Chinese importers accelerated purchases under existing contracts [3].

2) The Heavy Crude Advantage: Russia, Iran, and Venezuela are the world's primary producers of heavy sour crude—oil with high density and sulfur content that requires specific refinery configurations for processing. Refineries designed for heavy crude (primarily in Asia, but also in Europe) cannot easily switch to light sweet grades without costly and time-consuming modifications.

Venezuelan exports had already been severely disrupted following the capture of President Nicolás Maduro by US forces in January 2026 and the subsequent collapse of the Maduro government [6]. With Iranian exports now suspended, Russia remains virtually the only significant source of heavy crude accessible to global markets. As Igar Tyshkevych, a Kyiv-based political analyst, noted: "It means that Russian oil will be sought after because the rebuilding of technological processes of oil refineries takes long and costs a lot. It means that the discounts for Russian oil will change".

This dynamic has two implications. First, the discount on Russian Urals relative to Brent is likely to narrow, increasing per-barrel revenue. Second, Russia gains pricing power in negotiations with traditional buyers, who have fewer alternatives.

3) LNG Market Dynamics: The gas market presents a similar picture, though the dynamics are more complex. European LNG imports had diversified significantly since 2022, with the United States becoming the largest supplier (approximately 21% of French imports, 26% of European LNG imports overall). Qatar, however, remained a critical supplier, providing approximately 21% of French gas imports and similar shares for other European countries.

Qatar's suspension of LNG production following Iranian strikes on its facilities creates a significant supply gap. European buyers must now compete for available LNG cargoes in a tightening global market. Russia's Yamal LNG project, operated by Novatek with TotalEnergies as a key partner (20% stake), continues to export via the Northern Sea Route—a supply corridor unaffected by the Hormuz closure. Russian LNG exports to Europe, which had continued throughout the Ukraine war despite political pressure to cease, now become even more critical for European energy security.

As documented in our previous analysis, France imported €315 million worth of Russian LNG in January 2026—a 57% increase from December 2025—making it Europe's largest purchaser of Russian LNG. Belgium imported €171 million in the same month. These flows, which had been politically controversial but economically necessary, are now strategically vital. The Iran war thus reinforces Europe's continued dependence on Russian gas, despite stated intentions to phase it out by 2027.

C. The Strategic Option of Supply Manipulation

The price surge and market realignment create not only passive gains but also active strategic options for Moscow. President Vladimir Putin's March 4 statement explicitly linked the Iran conflict to European energy security, declaring that current price increases resulted from "the restrictions on Russian energy and the aggression of the US and Israel against Iran." He further warned that, given the EU's planned phase-out of Russian gas, Russia might preemptively "cut off" supplies to Europe and redirect volumes to emerging markets [4].

This threat, while rhetorical, points to a real strategic calculus. Russia now possesses enhanced leverage over European energy supplies. If Europe continues to support Ukraine, if it

maintains sanctions, if it proceeds with the planned phase-out of Russian gas, Moscow can credibly threaten to accelerate that phase-out on its own terms, creating immediate supply crises for European countries still dependent on Russian volumes. France, Belgium, Hungary, Slovakia, and Austria—all of whom continue to receive Russian gas in significant quantities—would be most vulnerable.

Conversely, Russia could offer supply guarantees to European countries willing to moderate their support for Ukraine or to advocate for sanctions relief. This selective approach—rewarding "friendly" European states while punishing "hostile" ones—represents a sophisticated form of energy statecraft, enabled by the supply tightness created by the Iran war.

D. Sanctions Evasion and Financial Flows

The economic benefits extend beyond energy markets. The Iran war has distracted international attention and resources from sanctions enforcement, creating opportunities for Russia to expand its sanctions-evasion networks.

The Joint Expeditionary Force, a UK-led multinational naval task force operating in the Baltic Sea and North Sea to monitor suspicious vessel activity (including the "shadow fleet" of tankers transporting Russian oil in violation of the G7 price cap), has seen its resources partially redirected to the Middle East. Similarly, the US Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC), responsible for sanctions enforcement, has diverted analytical resources to tracking Iranian rather than Russian financial networks.

This distraction is not accidental. As one former US Treasury official noted anonymously: "When you're fighting a two-front war, something has to give. The administration's focus is on the hot war in Iran, not on enforcing sanctions against Russia. That creates windows of opportunity that Russian financial operatives are well-positioned to exploit".

These windows include:

- **Expansion of the shadow fleet**: Russia has reportedly accelerated acquisitions of second-hand tankers, many operating under flags of convenience, to transport oil to Asian buyers while evading the price cap. The distraction of Western naval assets reduces monitoring capacity.

- **Third-country facilitation**: Turkey, the UAE, and Kazakhstan have emerged as key hubs for Russian trade and financial flows since 2022. With Western attention focused on the Gulf, these facilitation networks can operate with reduced scrutiny.

- **Cryptocurrency and digital assets**: Russia has increasingly turned to cryptocurrencies and digital assets to conduct international transactions outside the SWIFT system. The regulatory and enforcement environment for these assets remains fragmented, and the diversion of Western enforcement resources creates additional space for their use.

E. Longer-Term Economic Implications

The immediate economic gains are clear, but the Iran war may also generate longer-term structural benefits for the Russian economy.

1) Realignment of Global Energy Infrastructure: The war accelerates ongoing trends in global energy infrastructure that advantage Russia. European efforts to reduce dependence on Russian gas had focused on building LNG import terminals and expanding renewable energy capacity. However, the disruption of Qatari LNG supplies exposes the vulnerability of this strategy: diversification away from Russian pipeline gas has created new dependencies on LNG supplies that must transit strategic chokepoints. The Hormuz closure demonstrates that these chokepoints are no more secure than Russian pipelines—indeed, they may be less secure, given the volatility of the Middle East.

This realization may slow or complicate European energy transition plans, prolonging the period during which Russian gas remains competitive. It may also encourage European buyers to maintain or even expand Russian supply relationships as a hedge against Middle Eastern instability [3], [4].

2) The "Green Transition" as Accumulation Frontier: Paradoxically, the war may also benefit Russia by accelerating certain dimensions of the "green transition" that create new opportunities for Russian economic actors. The EU's REPowerEU plan, adopted in 2022 to phase out Russian fossil fuels, included massive investments in renewable energy, hydrogen infrastructure, and energy efficiency. These investments represent a new frontier of capital accumulation—one in which Russian companies, particularly those in the energy and technology sectors, may participate.

Lukoil, for example, has invested in renewable energy projects in Russia and abroad. Rosatom, the state nuclear corporation, is a major player in the global nuclear power market and has positioned itself as a leader in hydrogen production. Novatek's Yamal LNG project, while based on fossil fuels, has incorporated advanced technologies that could be deployed in renewable energy applications. The Iran war, by accelerating the energy transition in Europe, may paradoxically create markets for these Russian firms.

3) The China Factor: Finally, the Iran war may deepen Russia's economic integration with China, its most important economic partner since 2022. China is the primary destination for Russian oil and gas exports, the source of much of Russia's imported technology, and a critical partner in developing Arctic infrastructure and transport routes.

The Hormuz closure increases China's dependence on Russian energy supplies, as alternative sources (Iran, the Gulf) become unavailable or unreliable. This dependence gives Moscow leverage in negotiations over pipeline development, pricing, and technology transfer. It may also encourage China to accelerate investments in Russian infrastructure, including the Power of Siberia 2 pipeline, which would transport additional Russian gas to China [3].

F. Quantifying the Gains

While precise quantification is difficult given the fluidity of the situation, preliminary estimates suggest substantial economic gains:

- **Oil revenue**: At current prices ($62 per barrel for Urals) and export volumes (approximately 5 million barrels per day), Russia earns roughly $310 million per day from oil exports, or approximately $9.3 billion per month. Every $1 increase in the Urals price adds approximately $150 million per month to this total. The $22 increase from late February to early March thus generates approximately $3.3 billion in additional monthly revenue [4].

- **Gas revenue**: Russian gas exports to Europe (pipeline and LNG) currently total approximately 15 billion cubic meters per month, at prices averaging $400 per thousand cubic meters. This generates approximately $6 billion per month. European gas prices have increased approximately 30% since the war began, adding roughly $1.8 billion per month to Russian revenue [4].

- **Total windfall**: Combined oil and gas revenue gains from the price surge amount to approximately $5–6 billion per month—equivalent to roughly 1% of Russia's annual GDP on a sustained basis.

These estimates do not include gains from increased export volumes, improved pricing relative to Brent, or the strategic value of enhanced leverage over European buyers. They also do not include the fiscal benefits of reduced sanctions enforcement or the long-term structural advantages discussed above.

TABLE I
ESTIMATED RUSSIAN ENERGY REVENUE GAINS FROM IRAN WAR

Indicator	Pre-War (Feb 2026)	Post-War (Mar 2026)	Change
Urals price ($/barrel)	40	62	+55%
Oil export revenue ($bn/month)	6.0	9.3	+3.3
European gas price ($/mcm)	300	400	+33%
Gas export revenue ($bn/month)	4.5	6.0	+1.5
Total monthly revenue ($bn)	**10.5**	**15.3**	**+4.8**

G. Conclusion: The Economic Dividend

The economic dimension of Russia's gains from the Iran war is substantial and multifaceted. The price surge alone generates a fiscal windfall of $5–6 billion per month, providing critical breathing room for a war-strained budget. Structural factors—the elimination of Iranian competition, Russia's unique position as a heavy crude supplier, the continued European dependence on Russian LNG—amplify these gains and create lasting advantages. Strategic options, including the threat of supply manipulation, give Moscow leverage over European energy security. And the distraction of Western enforcement resources creates opportunities for expanded sanctions evasion.

These economic gains are not accidental. They result from Russia's structural position in global energy markets, its decade-long cultivation of relationships with key buyers (China, India, Turkey), and its strategic hedging posture, which preserved its ability to benefit from Middle Eastern instability. As we shall see in the following sections, these economic gains interact with and amplify gains in other domains—military-strategic, diplomatic, and ideological—creating a cumulative strategic dividend that enhances Russia's position in its confrontation with the West.

IV. THE MILITARY-STRATEGIC DIMENSION: DIVERSION, DEPLETION, AND THE UKRAINIAN FRONT

If the economic gains from the Iran war are immediate and quantifiable, the military-strategic benefits are potentially more consequential for the trajectory of the conflict that has defined Russia's international position since 2022: the war in Ukraine. This section analyzes how the US-led intervention in Iran alleviates pressure on Russian forces, depletes critical Western military stocks, diverts intelligence and planning assets, and reshapes the strategic calculus of Ukraine's supporters.

A. The Diversion of Precision Munitions

The most immediate and tangible military-strategic gain for Russia is the diversion of Western precision-guided munitions to the Middle Eastern theater. The US-led campaign against Iran, particularly in its opening phases, has required the expenditure of significant quantities of precisely the types of munitions that have been most critical to Ukraine's defensive and offensive operations.

1) Tomahawk Cruise Missiles: US naval forces in the Persian Gulf and Arabian Sea have launched hundreds of Tomahawk land-attack cruise missiles against Iranian targets since February 28. These missiles, with a range of approximately 1,600 kilometers and precision strike capabilities, are among the most versatile and valuable weapons in the US arsenal. They are also weapons that Ukrainian officials had repeatedly requested from Western allies to enhance their long-range strike capabilities against Russian command centers, logistics hubs, and naval assets in the Black Sea.

Each Tomahawk expended in Iran is a Tomahawk that cannot be transferred to Ukraine—or that must be replaced through new production, which requires time and diverts industrial capacity. The US Navy's inventory of Tomahawks, while substantial, is not unlimited. The Congressional Research Service estimated in 2025 that the US inventory stood at approximately 4,000 missiles, with annual production capacity of roughly 500–600 units. Sustained operations in Iran could deplete this inventory significantly, limiting the availability of missiles for potential transfer to Ukraine or for use in a Taiwan contingency.

2) Patriot Air Defense Interceptors: Even more critically, the Iran war is depleting stocks of air defense interceptors essential for Ukraine's protection against Russian missile and drone attacks. Ukraine operates several Patriot air defense batteries, supplied by the United States and Germany, which have been instrumental in intercepting Russian Kinzhal hypersonic missiles and other advanced threats. Each Patriot battery requires a steady supply of PAC-2 and PAC-3 interceptor missiles to remain operational.

Lockheed Martin, the primary manufacturer of Patriot interceptors, produces approximately 600 PAC-3 missiles annually. This production volume, as the Kyiv-based Ukrainian Security and Cooperation Centre notes, is insufficient to simultaneously

support Ukraine's defensive needs and the requirements of US allies in the Gulf who are now facing Iranian ballistic missile attacks [8].

Since the Iran strikes began, Iran has launched hundreds of ballistic missiles at US bases and allied targets in the Gulf region. Most of these missiles have been intercepted by Patriot and other air defense systems operated by US forces and Gulf Cooperation Council states. Each interception consumes one or more interceptor missiles, depleting regional stocks and drawing from the same global supply pool on which Ukraine depends.

Polish Foreign Minister Radosław Sikorski, whose country has been a key supporter of Ukraine and a recipient of Patriot systems for its own defense, articulated the concern bluntly: "What has already been expended definitely will not be available for transfer—or even sale—to Ukraine". This assessment reflects a simple logistical reality: interceptor missiles expended in the Middle East cannot be simultaneously used or transferred to Ukraine.

Lieutenant General Ihor Romanenko, former deputy chief of the Ukrainian military's General Staff, confirmed Ukrainian anxieties: "We felt a serious deficit before the war, and there is a high probability that the situation will only get worse. Patriot missiles are manufactured in very low numbers. Americans have tried to change it, but with such demand, it can't be done fast".

3) Artillery Shells and Other Munitions: Beyond precision-guided missiles, the Iran war may also affect the availability of conventional artillery shells, which have been the dominant munition in the Ukraine conflict. The US has supplied Ukraine with over 3 million 155mm artillery shells since 2022, drawing from Pentagon stocks and funding production increases through the Defense Production Act.

The Gulf states, particularly Saudi Arabia and the UAE, have historically been major purchasers of US artillery munitions. If these states face renewed threats from Iranian-backed forces or require replenishment of their own stocks depleted by the conflict, they may place urgent orders that compete with Ukrainian supply lines. While US production capacity for artillery shells has increased significantly since 2022 (from approximately 14,000 per month pre-war to over 40,000 per month in 2025), demand from multiple theaters could still outstrip supply.

B. The Diversion of Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Assets

Equally significant, though less visible, is the diversion of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) assets from the Ukrainian theater to the Middle East. Sustaining a high-intensity air campaign against Iran, monitoring Iranian ballistic missile launches, tracking Iranian naval movements in the Gulf, and assessing battle damage requires an array of ISR capabilities that are in limited supply globally.

1) Satellite Intelligence: The US National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) operates a constellation of imagery and signals intelligence satellites that provide critical data to Ukrainian forces. This satellite intelligence has been instrumental in targeting Russian command posts, artillery positions, and logistics nodes, as well as in providing early warning of Russian air and missile attacks.

The Iran campaign requires intensive satellite coverage of a vast area stretching from the Persian Gulf to the Caspian Sea, including Iranian nuclear facilities, military installations, and ballistic missile launch sites. This coverage must be sustained 24/7 to support strike planning, battle damage assessment, and threat warning. Reallocating satellite resources to meet these requirements inevitably reduces coverage of the Ukrainian theater, creating gaps that Russian forces can exploit.

2) Airborne Surveillance Assets: The US Air Force operates a fleet of specialized surveillance aircraft—including the E-3 Sentry AWACS (Airborne Warning and Control System), the RC-135 Rivet Joint signals intelligence aircraft, and the RQ-4 Global Hawk high-altitude drone—that have provided critical battlefield intelligence to Ukrainian forces. These assets are now being redeployed to the Middle East to support operations against Iran.

The E-3 Sentry, which provides airborne command and control and tracks hostile aircraft and missiles, is particularly critical for air defense coordination. With Iran launching hundreds of ballistic missiles and drones at Gulf targets, multiple E-3s must be on station continuously, requiring the redeployment of aircraft previously allocated to European and NATO missions. Similarly, RC-135 Rivet Joint aircraft, which intercept and analyze enemy communications and radar emissions, are essential for understanding Iranian military intentions and capabilities.

3) The Starlink Factor: A unique dimension of the Ukraine war has been the role of Starlink, the satellite internet system operated by SpaceX, in maintaining Ukrainian command, control, and communications. Starlink terminals have enabled Ukrainian forces to maintain connectivity even when terrestrial infrastructure is destroyed, facilitating drone operations, artillery targeting, and secure communications.

The Iran theater now demands Starlink capacity as well. US and allied forces in the Gulf require robust, secure communications, and Starlink provides a valuable supplement to military satellite systems. While SpaceX has not publicly disclosed Starlink terminal allocations, it is reasonable to assume that some capacity previously dedicated to Ukraine has been redirected to the Middle East, potentially degrading Ukrainian connectivity.

C. The Diversion of Attention and Planning Resources

Beyond physical assets, the Iran war diverts the attention and planning resources of Western military and political leaders away from Ukraine. This "attention diversion" is perhaps the most difficult to quantify but potentially the most consequential for the trajectory of the conflict.

1) The "Two-Front" Problem: US European Command (EUCOM) and US Central Command (CENTCOM) are separate unified combatant commands, each with its own planning staff, intelligence resources, and operational focus. However,

they draw from the same pool of senior military leaders, civilian policymakers, and intelligence analysts. A crisis requiring sustained high-level attention in the CENTCOM area inevitably reduces the bandwidth available for EUCOM contingencies, including Ukraine.

Senior US military officers who had been focused on Ukrainian force planning, training missions, and logistics coordination must now divide their attention between Ukraine and Iran. National Security Council staff who had been managing interagency coordination on Ukraine assistance must now also manage a complex Middle Eastern crisis. The intelligence community must allocate analytical resources to Iranian political dynamics, military capabilities, and regional implications, reducing the depth of analysis available on Russian intentions and Ukrainian requirements.

As one former Pentagon official noted: "The NSC [National Security Council] is now running two hot wars. That's not something anyone planned for, and it's not something the system is designed to handle. Something has to give, and usually what gives is the crisis that's been going on longer—the one people assume can manage itself for a while".

2) Diplomatic Distraction: The Iran war also distracts diplomatic attention from Ukraine. Secretary of State Marco Rubio, who had been engaged in intensive shuttle diplomacy to maintain European unity on Ukraine, is now consumed by Middle East crisis management. Special Envoy for Ukraine Keith Kellogg, whose role had been to coordinate Ukraine policy across the US government, finds his portfolio expanded to include Iran-related issues. The US embassy in Kyiv, already operating under reduced staffing due to security concerns, receives less attention from Washington as the crisis deepens.

This diplomatic distraction has tangible consequences. Proposed peace negotiations, which had been tentatively scheduled for March 2026 in Abu Dhabi, were indefinitely postponed after the UAE became a target of Iranian retaliatory strikes. Planned meetings of the Ukraine Defense Contact Group (the "Ramstein format") have been rescheduled as defense ministers focus on Middle Eastern contingencies. Discussions of additional security assistance packages have been delayed as appropriators focus on emergency funding for the Iran campaign.

D. The Depletion of US Credibility and Alliance Cohesion

Beyond the diversion of physical and cognitive resources, the Iran war depletes US credibility and tests alliance cohesion in ways that advantage Russia. A fractured Western alliance, uncertain of US commitment and divided over strategic priorities, is less capable of sustaining the unified pressure on Russia that has characterized the post-2022 period.

1) The Consultation Deficit: European leaders were not properly consulted before the US-Israeli strikes on Iran began, exposing fresh strains within the NATO alliance. While the US provided briefings to key allies shortly before the operation, there was no meaningful consultation on the decision to strike, the targeting strategy, or the escalation risks. This lack of consultation reinforces European anxieties about US reliability and unilateralism that have persisted since the Trump administration.

President Trump's public criticism of UK Prime Minister Keir Starmer over the UK's stance on Iran—reportedly telling Starmer he was "very disappointed" in the UK's cautious posture—further strained relations. Such public recriminations, unprecedented in modern transatlantic relations, undermine the perception of allied unity and provide openings for Russian influence operations seeking to exploit Western divisions.

2) The European Dilemma: European allies now face a strategic dilemma. They must balance their commitment to Ukraine, their dependence on US security guarantees, their exposure to Middle Eastern instability (including potential terrorist attacks and refugee flows), and their relationships with key regional actors, including Iran and the Gulf states. This dilemma creates divisions within Europe itself.

Some European states, particularly those with historical ties to the Gulf (the UK, France) and those most exposed to Iranian retaliation (Germany, given its intelligence cooperation with Israel), may support the US posture. Others, particularly those with significant trade or diplomatic relationships with Iran (Italy, Spain), may urge restraint. Still others, focused primarily on the Russian threat (Poland, the Baltic states), may worry that Middle Eastern entanglements will distract from the primary challenge in Eastern Europe.

These divisions complicate European efforts to maintain a unified stance on Russia sanctions, Ukraine assistance, and strategic messaging. As divisions deepen, Russia gains opportunities to exploit them through targeted diplomacy, disinformation, and economic inducements.

3) The "Two-Front" Anxiety in Kyiv: For Ukrainian officials, the Iran war generates profound anxiety. President Volodymyr Zelenskyy acknowledged this concern publicly, stating: "If there are long-term hostilities in the Middle East, this will certainly affect the supply. I am sure of this". This anxiety is well-founded: Ukraine depends on Western, particularly US, military assistance to sustain its defense. Any reduction in that assistance, whether due to munitions depletion, asset diversion, or attention deficits, threatens Ukraine's ability to hold the line against Russian forces.

Ukrainian forces are already facing significant challenges. Russian forces have made incremental gains in the Donbas, particularly around Bakhmut and Avdiivka, and have intensified missile and drone strikes against Ukrainian infrastructure. The diversion of Patriot interceptors and other air defense assets to the Middle East could leave Ukrainian cities more vulnerable to Russian aerial attack, with devastating humanitarian consequences and potential impacts on Ukrainian morale.

E. Russian Military Adaptation and Reduced Dependence on Iran

The military-strategic gains from the Iran war are amplified by Russia's reduced dependence on Iranian military supplies since 2022–2023. When Russia invaded Ukraine in February 2022, its domestic defense industrial base proved insufficient

to sustain the tempo of operations, leading to desperate measures including the activation of Soviet-era stocks and, critically, the procurement of Iranian drones.

1) The Localization of Drone Production: In late 2022, Russia and Iran reached an agreement for the transfer of Shahed-series loitering munitions. These drones, designated Geran-1 and Geran-2 in Russian service, became a signature weapon in Russia's campaign against Ukrainian infrastructure, allowing Russia to preserve its more expensive cruise missiles for priority targets while using drones to overwhelm Ukrainian air defenses.

By 2024, however, Russia had localized production of these drones at the Alabuga Special Economic Zone in Tatarstan. Russian engineers, working from Iranian blueprints and with Iranian technical assistance, developed upgraded versions with improved engines, enhanced anti-jamming capabilities, and increased payload capacity. By 2025, Russia was producing these drones domestically at a rate exceeding 100 per month, sufficient to sustain the campaign without Iranian supply.

This localization effort had two critical implications. First, it made Russia's drone campaign sustainable even if Iranian supplies were disrupted. Second, it gave Russia technical knowledge and production capacity that could be applied to other systems, potentially including more advanced unmanned aerial vehicles.

2) The North Korean Factor: While Iran provided critical drone technology in the early phases of the war, North Korea has emerged as a more important partner for conventional munitions. Since August 2023, North Korea has supplied Russia with millions of artillery shells, estimated to comprise up to 40% of Russia's shell consumption between August 2023 and May 2025. These supplies have been critical to sustaining Russia's artillery-intensive warfare in the Donbas.

North Korean supplies, unlike Iranian, are not vulnerable to disruption by the Iran war. North Korea's production capacity is unaffected by Middle Eastern events, and its transportation routes (primarily rail through China or maritime via Russian Far Eastern ports) remain open. The diversification of Russian supply sources since 2022 has thus reduced Moscow's vulnerability to any single partner's disruption.

3) Domestic Production Expansion: More fundamentally, Russia's domestic defense industrial base has expanded significantly since 2022. The Russian government has diverted substantial resources to defense production, placing the economy on a war footing. Tank production has increased, missile production has ramped up, and artillery shell production has reached levels sufficient to sustain current operations. While quality control and innovation challenges persist, Russia no longer faces the desperate shortages of 2022–2023.

As Russia researcher Hannah Notte summarizes: "Russia no longer needs Iran's help to sustain the war in Ukraine". This reduced dependence means Moscow can watch its Iranian partner suffer military setbacks without jeopardizing its own war effort. It also means Russia can afford to maintain a posture of strategic hedging, offering rhetorical support to Iran while avoiding material commitment.

F. Potential Secondary Military Benefits

Beyond the primary gains of diversion and depletion, the Iran war may generate secondary military benefits for Russia.

1) Operational Lessons: Russian military observers are closely studying US and Israeli operations against Iran, extracting lessons that can be applied to future operations against Ukraine or NATO. The performance of Iranian air defenses against US and Israeli strikes, the effectiveness of Iranian ballistic missiles against Gulf targets, the utility of drones in a high-intensity conventional conflict—all provide valuable data for Russian military planners.

If the conflict becomes protracted, it may also reveal US operational vulnerabilities: the sustainability of high-tempo air operations, the resilience of logistics chains under pressure, the effectiveness of coalition coordination. Each vulnerability identified is a potential vulnerability to be exploited in future contingencies.

2) Technology Transfer Opportunities: The conflict may create opportunities for technology transfer between Iran and Russia, despite Russia's reduced dependence. If Iranian forces capture US or Israeli equipment intact (or if such equipment is recovered from crash sites), this material could be shared with Russia for reverse engineering. If Iranian forces develop novel tactics or techniques, these could be adapted for Russian use.

Historically, Russia has benefited from such battlefield intelligence sharing with Iran. The Shahed drone itself was a reverse-engineered version of an earlier Iranian design. Future conflicts may generate additional such opportunities.

3) The "Bleeding" of US Forces: Finally, a protracted conflict in Iran would "bleed" US forces in ways that advantage Russia. Every US servicemember killed or wounded in Iran is a reminder of the human cost of US interventionism, potentially eroding domestic support for foreign engagements. Every dollar spent on the Iran campaign is a dollar not spent on modernization or readiness for potential conflicts with Russia or China. Every month the conflict continues is a month the US is distracted from the strategic competition that, by its own official doctrine, is the primary focus of US national security policy.

As one analysis concluded: "For the Kremlin, the ideal outcome is not Iranian triumph but American entanglement. A prolonged Middle East crisis that absorbs U.S. attention, drains resources and unsettles allies would validate Putin's hard-power worldview and ease pressure on his war in Ukraine. In that sense, the greatest gift may not be territory or alliances, but time".

G. Quantifying the Military-Strategic Gains

While precise quantification of military-strategic gains is impossible, the dimensions of the advantage can be summarized:

- **Munitions depletion**: Hundreds of Tomahawk missiles and Patriot interceptors expended, reducing availability for Ukraine.

- **Asset diversion**: Multiple ISR aircraft and satellites redeployed from European to Middle Eastern coverage.
- **Attention diversion**: Senior military and civilian leaders now managing two crises, reducing bandwidth for Ukraine.
- **Diplomatic distraction**: Planned peace talks and assistance coordination meetings delayed or disrupted.
- **Alliance strain**: Transatlantic tensions exacerbated, European unity tested, divisions within Europe deepened.
- **Russian insulation**: Reduced dependence on Iranian supplies means Moscow can benefit from the crisis without bearing its costs.

Each of these dimensions, individually, represents a marginal advantage. Collectively, they represent a significant shift in the strategic landscape—a shift that advantages Russia at a critical moment in its war with Ukraine.

H. Conclusion: The Military-Strategic Dividend

The military-strategic gains from the Iran war are substantial and multifaceted. The diversion of precision munitions, particularly Patriot interceptors, directly threatens Ukraine's ability to defend its cities and infrastructure. The diversion of ISR assets degrades the intelligence support on which Ukrainian operations depend. The diversion of attention and planning resources reduces the bandwidth available for Ukraine policy. The depletion of US credibility and the testing of alliance cohesion create openings for Russian influence operations and strategic exploitation.

These gains are amplified by Russia's reduced dependence on Iranian supplies, which allows Moscow to benefit from the crisis without sharing its costs. They are also cumulative: each gain interacts with and reinforces the others, creating a strategic dividend that extends beyond any single dimension.

As we shall see in the following section, these military-strategic gains interact with the economic gains analyzed previously and with the diplomatic and ideological gains to be analyzed next. Together, they constitute a comprehensive strategic advantage—one that Russia did not create but is well-positioned to exploit.

V. The Diplomatic Dimension: Strategic Hedging and Regional Repositioning

The economic and military-strategic gains analyzed in the preceding sections are substantial, but they operate within a framework of existing relationships and capabilities. The diplomatic dimension of Russia's gains from the Iran war is potentially more transformative: it reshapes Russia's position in the Middle East, reconfigures its relationships with key regional actors, and positions Moscow as an indispensable power in a destabilized region. This section analyzes how Russia's posture of strategic hedging—maintaining close ties with Tehran while avoiding binding commitment—enables it to benefit from the crisis across multiple diplomatic fronts.

A. The Architecture of Strategic Hedging

Russia's approach to the Middle East since the Soviet collapse has been characterized by what analysts term "strategic hedging": maintaining cooperative relationships with multiple, often competing actors to preserve freedom of maneuver and maximize influence, while avoiding binding commitments that would constrain future options [7]. This approach, refined over three decades of engagement with the region, has positioned Russia to navigate the 2026 crisis more effectively than any other external power.

1) The Hedging Portfolio: Russia's hedging portfolio in the Middle East includes relationships with:

- **Iran**: A strategic partnership encompassing military-technical cooperation, energy coordination, and aligned positions on Syria and other regional issues. This relationship, deepened significantly since 2022, gives Russia access to Iranian military technology (including drones) and influence over Iranian decision-making.

- **Israel**: A complex relationship combining security dialogue (including the deconfliction mechanism in Syria), economic ties (including significant Russian-Israeli trade and investment), and cultural connections (including a large Russian-speaking population in Israel). This relationship gives Russia influence with a key US ally and access to Israeli technology.

- **Saudi Arabia**: An energy partnership through OPEC+ that coordinates oil production policies and stabilizes global markets. This relationship, cultivated personally by Putin and Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, gives Russia influence over Gulf energy policy and access to Saudi investment.

- **UAE**: A multifaceted relationship encompassing trade, investment, and security cooperation. The UAE has become a hub for Russian capital flight since 2022 and a key node in Russia's sanctions evasion networks. It has also maintained security dialogue with Moscow despite Western pressure.

- **Qatar**: An energy relationship (Qatar is a major LNG producer and competitor, but also a potential partner in gas cartel arrangements) and a diplomatic relationship (Qatar has hosted talks on Afghanistan and other issues). Qatar's massive US military presence complicates its relationship with Russia, but does not preclude dialogue.

- **Turkey**: A relationship of competitive cooperation encompassing energy (TurkStream pipeline), security (coordination in Syria and Libya), and economic ties. Turkey's purchase of Russian S-400 air defense systems in 2019, despite NATO opposition, exemplified the depth of this relationship.

This diversified portfolio insulates Russia from overdependence on any single relationship. If one relationship sours, others remain. If conflicts arise between Russia's partners (as they frequently do), Moscow can mediate rather than choose sides.

2) The Refusal of Alliance: The critical element of Russia's hedging posture, for purposes of analyzing the 2026 crisis, is its consistent refusal to enter into a formal alliance with Iran. Despite deepening military-technical cooperation, despite shared strategic interests in Syria and opposition to

US influence, despite Iranian entreaties for a more binding commitment, Russia has maintained its freedom of action.

The most significant instance of this refusal came in January 2025, when Iran reportedly proposed a mutual defense treaty that would have committed each party to come to the other's defense in case of attack. The proposed treaty, according to sources familiar with the negotiations, would have granted Russia access to the Chabahar naval base on the Indian Ocean—a long-sought strategic asset—in exchange for a formal security guarantee [9].

Russia declined. The reasons for this refusal are now clear:

- **Preservation of relationships with Israel and Gulf states**: A formal alliance with Iran would have alienated Israel, Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and other Gulf states, undermining Russia's broader regional position.

- **Avoidance of entanglement**: A mutual defense treaty would have committed Russia to intervene in any US-Israeli conflict with Iran, potentially drawing Moscow into a war it did not choose and could not control.

- **Maintenance of mediation capacity**: By remaining formally unaligned, Russia preserves its ability to mediate between Iran and its adversaries—a role that enhances its prestige and influence.

- **Insurance against Iranian collapse**: If the Iranian regime were to fall (as the Assad regime fell in Syria in November 2024 and the Maduro regime fell in Venezuela in January 2026), a formal alliance would have made Russia complicit in its defeat. By maintaining distance, Russia avoids this liability.

This refusal, criticized by some in Tehran as evidence of Russian unreliability, now appears as a strategic masterstroke. It positions Russia to benefit from the 2026 crisis without bearing its costs.

B. The Immediate Diplomatic Response

Russia's diplomatic response to the February 28 strikes followed a carefully calibrated pattern, designed to maximize benefits while minimizing costs.

1) Rhetorical Support for Iran: On March 1, Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov issued a statement condemning the US-Israeli strikes as a "cynical violation of all norms of human morals and international law" [10]. This condemnation, while forceful, was purely rhetorical. It offered Tehran symbolic support without committing Moscow to any concrete action.

Dmitry Medvedev, deputy chair of the Russian Security Council, went further in a social media post, sarcastically calling President Trump a "peacekeeper who showed his real face" [11]. Such statements, aimed at domestic and international audiences, reinforce Russia's image as a counterweight to US unilateralism while requiring no material sacrifice.

Critically, Russia did not offer Iran any military assistance, nor did it activate any of the cooperation mechanisms established in previous years. No Russian aircraft were dispatched to Iran. No Russian air defense systems were transferred. No Russian advisors were deployed. The support was, and remains, purely verbal.

2) Outreach to Gulf States: Simultaneously with its rhetorical support for Iran, Moscow intensified outreach to the Gulf states that had been targets of Iranian retaliation. On March 2, Putin held phone calls with the leaders of the UAE, Bahrain, and Qatar [5]. The content of these calls, as described by Kremlin readouts, was carefully calibrated:

- **Condemnation of the strikes**: Putin condemned the US-Israeli strikes as "unprovoked aggression," aligning with Gulf concerns about regional destabilization.

- **Offer of mediation**: Putin offered to use Russia's ties with Tehran to "help restore calm" and to serve as a conduit for Gulf concerns to Iranian leadership. This offer positioned Moscow as an indispensable intermediary.

- **Emphasis on stability**: Putin emphasized the need for "an immediate ceasefire and a return to the political and diplomatic process," aligning with Gulf interests in de-escalation.

- **Bilateral assurances**: Putin reassured Gulf leaders of Russia's commitment to bilateral relationships and energy market stability, regardless of the crisis's evolution.

The timing and content of these calls were significant. They demonstrated to Gulf leaders that Russia, unlike the United States, was willing to consult with them before taking action. They offered a channel to Tehran that Gulf states, which have no diplomatic relations with Iran, otherwise lack. And they signaled that Russia's relationship with the Gulf would survive the crisis intact, and perhaps even deepen.

3) Engagement with Israel: Russia's relationship with Israel, severely strained by the Ukraine war and Russia's deepening ties with Iran, required careful management. Moscow's response balanced its rhetorical support for Iran with signals to Jerusalem that the bilateral relationship remained valuable.

Official Russian statements avoided direct criticism of Israel, focusing condemnation on the United States as the primary actor. This framing, while technically accurate (the strikes were US-Israeli, but US leadership was clear), allowed Russia to maintain relations with Israel while still appearing to support Iran.

Behind the scenes, Russian diplomats reportedly communicated to Israeli officials that Moscow would not interfere with Israeli operations against Iranian targets, provided they did not endanger Russian personnel or interests. This message, consistent with the deconfliction mechanism that has operated in Syria since 2015, reassured Israel that Russia would not become a belligerent.

C. The Mediation Gambit

Russia's offer to mediate between Iran and the United States, while unlikely to be accepted given US rejection of similar offers in March and June 2025, serves multiple strategic purposes.

1) Enhancing Prestige: By offering mediation, Russia positions itself as a responsible great power capable of resolving international crises. This image contrasts sharply with the US image as an aggressor acting unilaterally and without consultation. It reinforces the Kremlin's narrative that Russia,

despite its isolation since 2022, remains an indispensable actor in global affairs.

2) Cementing Relationships: Even if the mediation offer is not accepted, the act of offering it cements Russia's relationships with both parties. Iran appreciates Russia's willingness to advocate on its behalf. Gulf states appreciate Russia's willingness to engage diplomatically rather than militarily. Both sets of actors, regardless of the offer's success, are reminded of Russia's value as a partner.

3) Gaining Information: Mediation efforts, even if unsuccessful, generate information. They require engagement with all parties, revealing their red lines, their flexibility, their internal debates. This information is valuable to Moscow regardless of the mediation's outcome.

4) Preparing for Post-War Diplomacy: If the conflict ends through negotiation rather than military victory, Russia will be positioned as a natural participant in post-war diplomacy. Its relationships with all parties, its offer of mediation, and its permanent seat on the UN Security Council make it indispensable to any lasting settlement. This position ensures that Russian interests will be considered in any post-war arrangement.

D. Deepening Gulf Ties

The most significant diplomatic gain from the Iran war may be the deepening of Russia's ties with Gulf monarchies. These states, historically aligned with the United States and suspicious of Russian intentions, are now reassessing their security relationships in light of the crisis.

1) The Erosion of US Credibility: The US response to Iranian retaliation against Gulf states has been viewed critically in regional capitals. Despite US assurances of protection, Gulf states were hit by Iranian missiles and drones. Despite US military presence in the region, the attacks occurred. Despite US promises of consultation, Gulf leaders were not informed before the strikes on Iran that provoked the retaliation.

This erosion of US credibility creates an opening for Russia. As one Gulf official reportedly commented: "We have learned that American guarantees are not guarantees. We must diversify our security relationships" [12].

2) Russia as a Security Alternative: Russia offers Gulf states a security alternative that, while not equivalent to the US military presence, provides valuable diversification. Russian weapons systems (air defense, aircraft, electronic warfare) are familiar to Gulf militaries. Russian diplomatic support in international forums (the UN Security Council, where Russia has veto power) is valuable. Russian relationships with Iran and other regional actors provide channels of communication and potential leverage.

Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman's reported acknowledgment that Russia could play a "stabilizing role" due to its relationships with both Iran and Gulf states signals a significant shift in Saudi thinking [13]. Such acknowledgment, even if preliminary, opens the door to deeper security cooperation.

3) Economic Opportunities: Beyond security, the crisis creates economic opportunities for deepened Russia-Gulf ties. Gulf sovereign wealth funds, among the largest in the world, may seek to invest in Russian assets discounted by sanctions. Russian energy companies may seek Gulf partners for joint ventures. Gulf states may increase purchases of Russian weapons, diversifying their defense procurement away from exclusive dependence on the US.

The UAE, already a hub for Russian capital and trade since 2022, is particularly well-positioned to benefit from these trends. Its sophisticated financial infrastructure, its willingness to maintain relationships with sanctioned entities, and its diplomatic flexibility make it an ideal partner for Russia in navigating the post-war landscape.

E. The China Factor

No analysis of Russia's diplomatic gains would be complete without considering China's role. Beijing's response to the Iran war, and its implications for Russia, must be analyzed.

1) Beijing's Dilemma: China faces a complex dilemma in the Iran crisis. It has significant economic interests in Iran, including oil purchases and infrastructure investments. It has diplomatic interests in maintaining relationships with all Gulf states. It has strategic interests in countering US influence in the Middle East. And it has a growing partnership with Russia that it values but does not wish to see become subordinate.

Beijing's initial response to the crisis was measured: it called for restraint, urged a return to diplomacy, and blocked UN Security Council resolutions that would have endorsed the US strikes. This posture aligns with Russia's position and avoids alienating any party.

2) Russia-China Coordination: The crisis creates opportunities for Russia-China coordination. Both powers share an interest in limiting US unilateralism, preserving their relationships with Iran, and maintaining stability in global energy markets. Both have veto power in the UN Security Council and can block resolutions unfavorable to their interests. Both have relationships with Gulf states that they wish to preserve and deepen.

The crisis may accelerate the trend toward Russia-China strategic coordination that has intensified since 2022. Joint diplomatic initiatives, coordinated energy policies, and aligned positions in international forums could emerge from the crisis, further consolidating the axis that challenges US dominance.

3) The Risk of Competition: However, the crisis also creates risks of Russia-China competition. Both powers seek influence in the Gulf, and both may view the post-war reconstruction of Iran as an economic opportunity. If they compete rather than coordinate, they may undermine each other's positions and create openings for the US to exploit.

Managing this competition will require careful diplomacy. Moscow and Beijing have demonstrated since 2022 an ability to manage their relationship despite divergent interests. The Iran crisis will test this ability.

F. Longer-Term Diplomatic Implications

The diplomatic gains from the Iran war extend beyond immediate crisis management. They reshape Russia's long-term position in the Middle East and beyond.

1) Russia as an Indispensable Power: The crisis reinforces Russia's status as an indispensable power in the Middle East. No major regional issue can be resolved without Russian participation. No lasting security architecture can exclude Russia. This status enhances Russia's bargaining power with all parties and ensures that Russian interests will be considered in any regional arrangement.

2) The Normalization of Russian Engagement: The crisis normalizes Russian engagement with Gulf states that had been hesitant since 2022. By demonstrating its utility as a mediator and its reliability as a partner (unlike the US, which acted without consultation), Russia makes itself more attractive to Gulf leaders. Future Russian-Gulf cooperation, whether in energy, security, or investment, becomes more likely.

3) The Weakening of US-Led Alliances: The crisis weakens US-led alliances in the region. Gulf states, having seen US guarantees fail and US consultation absent, will seek to diversify their security relationships. This diversification, while not necessarily involving formal alignment with Russia, reduces US influence and creates space for Russian engagement.

4) The Legitimation of Russian Narratives: Finally, the crisis legitimates Russian narratives about international order. For years, Moscow has argued that the US-led order is hypocritical, that international law is selectively applied, and that power, not rules, determines outcomes. The US intervention in Iran, undertaken without UN authorization, without clear justification, and without consultation with allies, validates this narrative. It undermines the moral authority that the US had claimed in condemning Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

G. Conclusion: The Diplomatic Dividend

The diplomatic gains from the Iran war are potentially transformative for Russia's regional and global position. By maintaining a posture of strategic hedging—supporting Iran rhetorically while avoiding commitment, reaching out to Gulf states while preserving ties with Israel, offering mediation while preparing for post-war diplomacy—Moscow positions itself as an indispensable actor in a destabilized region.

These gains interact with and reinforce the economic and military-strategic gains analyzed previously. Enhanced diplomatic influence translates into economic opportunities (energy contracts, investment deals) and military advantages (basing rights, intelligence sharing). The erosion of US credibility and the weakening of US-led alliances create space for Russian engagement across multiple dimensions.

As we shall see in the following section, these material gains are complemented by ideological gains that validate the Kremlin's worldview and undermine the normative foundations of the US-led order.

VI. The Ideological Dimension: Narrative Validation and the Spectacle's Collapse

The economic, military-strategic, and diplomatic gains analyzed in the preceding sections are substantial and measurable. However, the most profound—and potentially most enduring—benefit accruing to Russia from the Iran war operates at the level of ideology and narrative. The conflict validates the Kremlin's worldview, exposes the hypocrisy of Western moral claims, undermines the normative foundations of the US-led order, and consolidates domestic support for the Putin regime. This section analyzes these ideological gains, drawing on the philosophical framework established in the introduction—Hegel's dialectic of truth and falsehood, Schmitt's state of exception, and Debord's spectacle.

A. The Validation of the Force-Based Worldview

Since his rise to power, and with increasing intensity since the 2007 Munich Security Conference speech, Vladimir Putin has articulated a consistent critique of the US-led international order. The core elements of this critique are:

- **The hypocrisy of liberal internationalism**: The US and its allies preach rules, norms, and international law, but act on the basis of power and interest. They intervene when it suits them, disregard international law when it constrains them, and expect others to accept outcomes they would not accept themselves.

- **The centrality of force**: International politics is ultimately shaped by power, not by rules. States that neglect their military capabilities, that rely on the goodwill of others, that subordinate their sovereignty to international institutions, will eventually be compelled to submit to those who possess force.

- **The decline of the West**: The US-led order is in terminal decline, undermined by its own contradictions, its overextension, and the rise of new powers (China, India, and a resurgent Russia). The "unipolar moment" of the 1990s is over; the future belongs to a multipolar world in which diverse civilizations and political systems coexist and compete.

The Iran war provides dramatic validation of each element of this critique.

1) Hypocrisy Exposed: The US intervention in Iran, undertaken without UN Security Council authorization, without clear justification under international law, and without meaningful consultation with allies, exposes the hypocrisy that Moscow has long denounced. The same US that condemned Russia's annexation of Crimea in 2014 and its invasion of Ukraine in 2022 now stands accused of violating the sovereignty of a UN member state. The same US that championed the "rules-based international order" now acts unilaterally, dismissing the rules when they constrain its actions.

This hypocrisy is not lost on global audiences, particularly in the Global South. As one analysis noted: "The main argument against the Russian aggression in Ukraine so far has been the rude violation of international law and Ukraine's sovereignty. Now we see another state, which is the US, also violating international law" [8]. For audiences in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, this confirmation of double standards

reinforces skepticism toward Western moral claims and opens space for alternative narratives.

Russian propagandists have exploited this opening effectively. State media outlets (RT, Sputnik) have saturated global information spaces with images of US missiles striking Tehran, juxtaposed with footage of Western leaders condemning Russian strikes in Ukraine. The message is simple and powerful: "They condemn us for doing exactly what they do. Their morality is a mask for power."

2) Force as the Final Arbiter: The Iran war demonstrates that force, not law, ultimately determines outcomes in international politics. Despite decades of diplomatic efforts to contain Iran, despite the JCPOA and subsequent negotiations, despite UN resolutions and multilateral sanctions, the US resorted to military force when it judged its interests required it. International law did not stop the strikes. The UN Security Council did not prevent them. Norms of sovereignty and non-intervention did not constrain them.

This demonstration validates the core premise of Russian foreign policy since 2007: that states must rely on their own military capabilities to protect their interests and ensure their security. Reliance on international institutions, on the goodwill of others, on the restraint of more powerful states—these are recipes for vulnerability and eventual subordination.

For Russian audiences, this lesson reinforces support for the military buildup that has consumed increasing shares of the federal budget since 2022. It justifies the sacrifices demanded by the Ukraine war. It validates Putin's leadership as the guarantor of Russian sovereignty against a predatory West.

3) The Decline of the West: The Iran war also demonstrates the decline of US power and the erosion of Western cohesion. Despite its overwhelming military superiority, the US cannot stabilize the Middle East, cannot protect its Gulf allies from Iranian retaliation, cannot maintain the unity of its coalition. European allies were not consulted; NATO was bypassed; the "rules-based order" proved incapable of restraining its chief architect.

This display of Western dysfunction validates Russian narratives of Western decline. The US, in this telling, is an overextended empire, lashing out violently as its relative power erodes. Europe is a collection of dependent states, unable to articulate independent policies, unwilling to challenge US leadership even when its interests diverge. The transatlantic alliance, the cornerstone of post-1945 order, is fracturing under the strain of multiple crises.

For Global South audiences, this image of a declining, dysfunctional West reinforces the attractiveness of alternative models—including the "multipolar" order that Russia and China advocate. Why align with a declining power when rising powers offer partnership without domination? Why accept lectures from a West that cannot manage its own affairs?

B. The Undermining of Western Moral Authority

Beyond validating Russian narratives, the Iran war actively undermines the moral authority that Western powers had claimed in condemning Russia's invasion of Ukraine. This undermining operates on multiple levels.

1) The "Whataboutism" Trap: Western officials and media had, since 2022, dismissed Russian accusations of hypocrisy as "whataboutism"—a rhetorical device that deflects criticism by pointing to the faults of others. "Two wrongs don't make a right," the argument went. "Russia's violations of international law are not justified by US violations elsewhere."

The Iran war, however, transforms this dynamic. It is no longer a question of past US violations (Iraq 2003, Libya 2011) that can be acknowledged while maintaining focus on Russia's present aggression. It is a present violation, occurring simultaneously with Russia's ongoing war in Ukraine, involving the same US administration that condemns Russian actions. The parallel is not historical; it is immediate.

This simultaneity makes the "whataboutism" defense untenable. If the US can invade Iran while condemning Russia for invading Ukraine, then the principle invoked is not sovereignty or international law, but power. The powerful may act; the weak must submit. This is precisely the worldview that Russian propaganda has long articulated.

2) The Erosion of the Liberal International Order: The liberal international order, as constructed after 1945 and extended after 1991, rests on a set of norms and institutions designed to constrain the use of force and regulate interstate relations. The UN Charter prohibits the use of force except in self-defense or with Security Council authorization. The Geneva Conventions regulate the conduct of war. The International Criminal Court prosecutes those who violate these norms.

The US intervention in Iran violates these norms at every level. It was not an act of self-defense (Iran had not attacked the US). It had no Security Council authorization (Russia and China would have vetoed any such resolution). Its conduct (including strikes that reportedly killed the Iranian head of state) raises serious questions under international humanitarian law.

Each violation erodes the normative framework that the US itself helped create. Each erosion makes it more difficult for the US to invoke these norms against others. Each difficulty opens space for alternative normative orders—including the "multipolar" order that Russia and China advocate, in which sovereignty is absolute and non-intervention is paramount.

3) The Global South Reaction: The reaction in the Global South to the Iran war has been instructive. While some US allies (the UK, Australia, Canada) expressed support, the majority of states in Africa, Asia, and Latin America remained silent or called for restraint. Few endorsed the US action. Many explicitly condemned it.

This reaction reflects a broader shift in Global South attitudes toward the West. The Ukraine war had already generated skepticism toward Western moral claims, as many Global South states noted the disparity between Western concern for Ukrainian refugees and Western indifference to refugees from Syria, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. The Iran war deepens this skepticism. If the US can invade Iran while condemning Russia

for invading Ukraine, then the entire edifice of Western moral authority collapses into a simple assertion of power.

For Russia, this shift is invaluable. It aligns Global South sentiment with Russian narratives, creates opportunities for diplomatic coordination (as in the UN General Assembly, where many states abstained or voted against US positions), and undermines Western efforts to isolate Russia internationally.

C. Domestic Consolidation and Regime Legitimation

The ideological gains from the Iran war are not limited to the international arena. They also operate domestically, reinforcing support for the Putin regime and legitimating the sacrifices demanded by the Ukraine war.

1) The "Besieged Fortress" Narrative: Russian domestic propaganda has long cultivated a "besieged fortress" narrative: Russia, in this telling, is a sovereign civilization surrounded by hostile powers seeking its destruction. The West, led by the US, is engaged in a permanent campaign to weaken, subjugate, and ultimately dismember Russia. The Ukraine war is not an aggressive land grab; it is a defensive operation against Western encroachment.

The Iran war validates this narrative. If the US can attack Iran—a sovereign state that had not attacked it—without UN authorization, without clear justification, without meaningful consultation—then what prevents it from attacking Russia? The answer, in the propaganda narrative, is only Russia's military strength and the leadership's determination to resist.

This validation strengthens domestic support for the war effort. It justifies the sacrifices (casualties, economic hardship, social disruption) that the war imposes. It reinforces the image of Putin as the defender of the nation against external threats. It marginalizes domestic opposition, which can be portrayed as naive at best, treasonous at worst.

2) The Contrast with Western "Hypocrisy": Domestic propaganda also emphasizes the contrast between Russian "restraint" and Western "aggression." Despite having the capability, the argument goes, Russia has not assassinated Zelenskyy. Despite facing existential threats, Russia has not bombed Western capitals. Despite Western provocations, Russia has acted with "responsibility" and "restraint."

The US, by contrast, has assassinated the Iranian head of state. It has bombed Iranian cities. It has threatened further escalation. This contrast, carefully cultivated in Russian media, positions Russia as the more "responsible" power—the one that observes norms even when its adversaries do not.

This framing serves multiple purposes. It legitimates Russia's own actions in Ukraine (which are presented as measured and proportionate). It undermines Western criticism of those actions (which is presented as hypocritical). It reinforces the image of Russia as a force for stability in a chaotic world.

3) Unifying the Elite: Beyond mass opinion, the Iran war unifies the Russian elite around the regime. In any authoritarian system, elite cohesion is essential to regime survival. Divisions within the elite create vulnerabilities that opponents can exploit.

The Iran war, by validating the regime's core narratives and demonstrating the "treachery" of the West, reinforces elite unity. Those who might have harbored doubts about the Ukraine war, who might have questioned the costs of confrontation with the West, now see their doubts refuted by events. The West, they observe, is exactly what the regime said it was: aggressive, hypocritical, and dangerous. The regime's policies, however costly, are validated by the adversary's actions.

This elite unification has practical consequences. It reduces the likelihood of palace coups or defections. It facilitates coordination between state institutions (the military, the security services, the bureaucracy). It enables the regime to sustain the war effort despite mounting costs.

D. The Collapse of the Spectacle

Returning to the philosophical framework established in the introduction, the Iran war represents a collapse of the spectacle—the system of representations that conceals the real dynamics of power.

1) The Spectacle Before the War: Before February 28, 2026, the spectacle of international politics was relatively coherent. The dominant narrative, propagated by Western media and political leaders, presented a clear moral hierarchy: democratic Ukraine, defending itself against authoritarian aggression, deserved support; autocratic Russia, violating international law and committing atrocities, deserved condemnation. This narrative, while always contested, structured global discourse and legitimated Western policy.

The spectacle also concealed. It concealed the structural drivers of the Ukraine war (NATO expansion, the crisis of Russian capitalism, the competition for resources and influence). It concealed the interests behind Western policy (the military-industrial complex, the energy sector, the financial industry). It concealed the contradictions within Western societies (inequality, democratic deficits, social fragmentation) that undermined their claim to moral leadership.

2) The Rupture: The Iran war ruptures this spectacle. The clear moral hierarchy dissolves: if the US can invade Iran while condemning Russia for invading Ukraine, then the principle invoked is not morality but power. The carefully constructed narrative of Western virtue collapses into visible hypocrisy.

This rupture reveals what the spectacle had concealed: the real dynamics of international politics. States, including the US, act on the basis of interest, not morality. Power, not law, determines outcomes. The "rules-based order" is a mask for domination, not a constraint on it.

For audiences worldwide, this revelation is disorienting. Those who had internalized Western narratives must now reconcile those narratives with visible contradiction. Those who had doubted Western claims find their doubts validated. The cognitive infrastructure of the liberal international order—the set of assumptions, narratives, and categories that made it seem natural and legitimate—is damaged, perhaps irreparably.

3) Russia's Position: In this ruptured landscape, Russia occupies a unique position. It is not the author of the rupture (the US is). It is not responsible for the spectacle's collapse. It is, however, positioned to benefit from it.

Russia's narratives, long dismissed as propaganda, now appear prescient. Its warnings about Western hypocrisy, about the force-based nature of international politics, about the decline of the liberal order—all are validated by events. Its critique of the spectacle is vindicated by the spectacle's self-destruction.

This validation enhances Russia's soft power, particularly in the Global South. States that had been skeptical of Russian narratives now find them confirmed. Intellectuals who had dismissed Russian critiques now engage them seriously. Elites who had aligned with the West now reconsider their options.

E. The Longer-Term Ideological Struggle

The ideological gains from the Iran war are not permanent. They must be consolidated through sustained effort. The longer-term ideological struggle will be shaped by several factors.

1) The Battle for Historical Memory: How will the Iran war be remembered? Will it be framed as a necessary intervention against a dangerous regime, or as an act of aggression that violated international law? Will the US be held accountable for its actions, or will they be forgotten as the spectacle reconstitutes itself?

This battle for historical memory is already underway. Russian media emphasize the illegality and immorality of the US action. Western media, while acknowledging some concerns, largely frame the intervention in terms of Iranian nuclear threats and regional stability. The outcome of this battle will shape the normative framework for future interventions.

2) The Reconstruction of the Spectacle: The spectacle, in Debord's analysis, is not static. It is constantly reconstituted, adapting to new conditions, incorporating new representations, healing its ruptures. The question is whether the Iran war represents a rupture that can be healed or a crisis that reveals the spectacle's fundamental fragility.

If the US can successfully manage the conflict, if it can stabilize the region, if it can reconstitute allied unity, then the spectacle may be repaired. The narrative would be: the US acted decisively to address a threat, succeeded in its objectives, and restored stability. The rupture would be forgotten.

If, however, the conflict becomes protracted, if it generates further instability, if it fractures alliances and empowers adversaries, then the rupture may be permanent. The narrative would be: the US acted recklessly, triggered a wider war, and demonstrated its unfitness for global leadership. The spectacle would not be repaired.

3) Russia's Role: Russia's role in this longer-term struggle will be shaped by its capacity to offer an alternative narrative. The Kremlin has articulated, over two decades, a coherent alternative to the liberal international order: a world of sovereign states, each pursuing its own interests, with no universal values, no right to intervene, no hierarchy of civilizations. This narrative, long dismissed as cynical, now appears more plausible to many.

If Russia can consolidate its position, deepen its partnerships, and demonstrate the viability of its model, it may emerge from the crisis as the ideological as well as the geopolitical beneficiary of the spectacle's collapse. If, however, it overreaches, if it fails to manage its own contradictions, if it proves incapable of offering a positive vision, then the moment may pass.

F. Conclusion: The Ideological Dividend

The ideological gains from the Iran war are profound and multifaceted. The conflict validates the Kremlin's worldview, exposing Western hypocrisy and demonstrating the centrality of force in international politics. It undermines Western moral authority, eroding the normative foundations of the US-led order. It consolidates domestic support for the Putin regime, reinforcing the "besieged fortress" narrative and unifying the elite around the leadership. It ruptures the spectacle, revealing the real dynamics that the spectacle had concealed.

These gains interact with and reinforce the economic, military-strategic, and diplomatic gains analyzed previously. Enhanced ideological legitimacy translates into enhanced soft power, which facilitates diplomatic engagement and economic cooperation. The erosion of Western moral authority weakens the coalition opposing Russia, creating space for Russian influence operations and strategic exploitation.

As we shall see in the following section, these gains must be understood within a broader dialectical framework—one that reveals both the opportunities and the contradictions inherent in Russia's position.

VII. Dialectical Synthesis: The War as a Moment of Truth

The preceding sections have analyzed Russia's gains from the 2026 Iran war across four dimensions: economic, military-strategic, diplomatic, and ideological. Each dimension, considered in isolation, reveals significant benefits accruing to Moscow. However, the full significance of these gains emerges only when they are understood dialectically—as moments of a larger process in which the contradictions of the global system are simultaneously revealed and provisionally managed.

This section synthesizes the analysis within the theoretical framework established in the introduction, demonstrating how the war functions as a "moment of truth" that reveals the real dynamics of power while also generating new contradictions that will shape the subsequent phase of global politics.

A. The Dialectic of Truth and Falsehood

Returning to the Hegelian aphorism reformulated by Debord—"the true is a moment of the false"—we can now appreciate the full significance of the Iran war as a revelatory event.

1) The Falsehood of Normalcy: In periods of relative stability, the spectacle functions effectively. The categories that organize social life—the state, the market, international law, democracy—appear as natural facts, not historical constructions. The relations of power and exploitation that these categories conceal remain invisible. The contradictions that threaten to tear the social fabric remain latent.

This is the "falsehood" of normalcy: not a lie in the trivial sense, but a systematic misrecognition of the real. It is the condition under which the social order reproduces itself without overt crisis.

2) The Truth of Crisis: Crisis ruptures the spectacle. The categories that had appeared natural reveal their contingency. The relations that had been concealed become visible. The contradictions that had been latent become active.

The Iran war is such a crisis. It reveals:

- **The true nature of the state**: Not a neutral arbiter or a servant of the common good, but an instrument of power capable of deciding on life and death, of suspending law in the name of security, of sacrificing some populations to preserve others. The US decision to strike Iran, taken without consultation, without clear legal justification, without concern for the human consequences, reveals the state in its Schmittian essence: as the entity that decides on the exception.

- **The true nature of international law**: Not a binding constraint on state action, but a discourse that legitimates some actions while condemning others, applied selectively according to power rather than principle. The US invokes international law when it suits its purposes (condemning Russia's invasion of Ukraine) and ignores it when it does not (invading Iran). The law is revealed as an instrument, not a framework.

- **The true nature of the market**: Not a spontaneous order of free exchange, but a field of power shaped by force and violence. The closure of the Strait of Hormuz, the surge in energy prices, the redirection of oil and gas flows—all demonstrate that the "market" is ultimately subordinate to the decisions of states and the outcomes of conflicts.

- **The true nature of value**: Not a natural property of commodities, but a social relation that can be created, destroyed, and recreated through violence. The destruction of Iranian infrastructure annihilates value. The reconstruction that will follow will create new value. The price surge transfers value from consumers to producers. War reveals that value is a convention, not a substance.

3) Russia's Position in the Dialectic: Russia's position in this dialectic is complex. It is not the author of the crisis—the US is. It is not the primary victim—Iran and the Gulf states are. It is, however, the primary beneficiary, precisely because its position has been less dependent on the spectacle's coherence.

Russia never fully invested in the liberal international order. It never accepted the categories of that order as natural or universal. It always insisted, in its foreign policy discourse and its domestic practice, on the primacy of power, the contingency of norms, the hypocrisy of Western moral claims. This skepticism, long dismissed as cynicism, now appears as realism.

By refusing to be fully integrated into the spectacle, Russia positioned itself to survive its collapse. By maintaining relationships with all parties to the conflict, it positioned itself to benefit from its outcomes. By articulating an alternative narrative, it positioned itself to shape the post-crisis order.

B. The Dialectic of Dissociation and Reintegration

The Wertkritik framework, and particularly Roswitha Scholz's concept of dissociation (Wert-Abspaltung), allows us to analyze the Iran war as a moment in the self-reproduction of a crisis-ridden system.

1) Dissociation: The Violent Separation: The war enacts a violent dissociation across multiple dimensions:

- **Spatial dissociation**: The war separates populations from territories, creating refugees and internally displaced persons. It destroys infrastructure that had integrated regions into the global economy. It creates zones of exception where normal life is suspended.

- **Temporal dissociation**: The war breaks the continuity of historical time, projecting societies into a perpetual present of crisis and survival. It suspends the future, making planning and investment impossible. It accelerates certain processes (destruction, displacement) while freezing others (development, reconstruction).

- **Social dissociation**: The war shatters social bonds, separating families, dispersing communities, destroying the institutions that organize collective life. It creates atomized individuals, vulnerable to manipulation and dependent on external aid.

- **Ecological dissociation**: The war treats nature as a battlefield, contaminating soils, poisoning waters, destroying ecosystems. It separates human societies from the natural conditions of their existence, creating environmental catastrophes that will persist for generations.

This dissociation is not random. It is organized—by the logic of the conflict, by the decisions of commanders, by the interests of the powers involved. It creates the "organized chaos" that precedes and enables subsequent reintegration.

2) Reintegration: The Reconstruction as Accumulation: Even as the war destroys, it prepares the ground for reconstruction. This reconstruction will not be a simple restoration of what was destroyed. It will be a transformation—a reintegration of the dissociated spheres into the circuit of capital on new terms.

The reconstruction of Iran, when it comes, will be a colossal project of capital accumulation. Estimates of the costs already exceed hundreds of billions of dollars. This reconstruction will be financed by international capital, managed by multinational corporations, and shaped by the interests of the powers that emerge victorious from the conflict.

The reconstruction will also be an opportunity for what David Harvey terms "accumulation by dispossession"—the transfer of assets from public to private hands, from local to foreign control, from use to exchange. Iranian state assets

will be privatized. Iranian markets will be opened to foreign investment. Iranian labor will be integrated into global supply chains.

This dynamic is not unique to Iran. It has been observed in every major conflict of the past century: the two world wars, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Iraq War. In each case, destruction prepared the ground for reconstruction, and reconstruction generated new rounds of accumulation.

3) Russia's Position in the Dissociation-Reintegration Dynamic: Russia's position in this dynamic is distinctive. It is not the primary agent of dissociation—the US is. It is not the primary site of dissociation—Iran is. It is, however, positioned to benefit from both phases of the process.

During the dissociation phase, Russia benefits from the disruption of global markets, the diversion of Western resources, and the erosion of US credibility. These gains, analyzed in previous sections, are essentially rents extracted from the chaos created by others.

During the reintegration phase, Russia will seek to participate in the reconstruction. Russian companies will bid for reconstruction contracts. Russian banks will seek to finance reconstruction projects. Russian diplomats will seek to ensure that Russian interests are respected in the post-war order.

The question is whether Russia can translate its wartime gains into post-war influence. This will depend on the outcome of the conflict, the configuration of post-war power, and Russia's capacity to sustain its engagement in the region.

C. The Dialectic of Hegemony and Counter-Hegemony

The Iran war must also be understood within the longer-term dynamic of hegemonic transition. Giovanni Arrighi's analysis of systemic cycles of accumulation provides a framework for understanding this dimension.

1) The Crisis of US Hegemony: The US has been the dominant power in the global system since 1945, and the hegemonic power (in the Gramscian sense of leading through consent as well as coercion) since 1991. This hegemony, however, has been in crisis for at least two decades. The Iraq War (2003) revealed the limits of US military power and the fragility of its moral authority. The 2008 financial crisis revealed the instability of its economic model. The Trump presidency (2017–2021) revealed the fragility of its democratic institutions. The Afghanistan withdrawal (2021) revealed its strategic overreach.

The Iran war represents a further stage in this crisis. It demonstrates that the US, unable to maintain its hegemony through consent, increasingly relies on coercion. It demonstrates that the US, unable to secure its interests through diplomacy, increasingly resorts to force. It demonstrates that the US, unable to maintain allied unity, increasingly acts unilaterally.

These are not signs of strength. They are signs of hegemonic decline—the transition from a phase of leadership based on consent to a phase of domination based on coercion, which is typically followed by accelerated decline.

2) The Emergence of a Counter-Hegemonic Bloc: The crisis of US hegemony creates space for counter-hegemonic forces. Russia, China, and other powers have sought since the 2000s to construct alternatives to US-led order. The Shanghai Cooperation Organization, BRICS, and other institutions represent efforts to build parallel structures of cooperation and coordination.

The Iran war accelerates this process. It demonstrates to states in the Global South that the US-led order cannot guarantee their security. It demonstrates that the US is willing to act unilaterally, without regard for allied interests. It demonstrates that the "rules-based order" is a mask for US dominance, not a framework for mutual benefit.

This demonstration strengthens the appeal of counter-hegemonic alternatives. It encourages states to diversify their security relationships, to reduce their dependence on the US, to explore partnerships with rising powers. It creates openings for Russian and Chinese influence.

3) Russia's Position in the Counter-Hegemonic Bloc: Russia's position in the emerging counter-hegemonic bloc is complex. It is not the leader of this bloc—China is, by virtue of its economic weight and global reach. It is not the primary beneficiary of anti-US sentiment—many states in the Global South resent Russian as well as US interventionism. It is, however, an essential component of any counter-hegemonic coalition.

Russia contributes military capabilities that China lacks, energy resources that China needs, and diplomatic influence that complements Chinese economic power. The Russia-China partnership, formalized in the "no limits" friendship declared in February 2022 and deepened since, is the axis around which any counter-hegemonic bloc must revolve.

The Iran war strengthens this axis. It demonstrates the value of Russian-Chinese coordination (both vetoed UN resolutions unfavorable to Iran). It creates opportunities for joint diplomatic initiatives. It aligns Russian and Chinese interests in limiting US unilateralism and preserving their relationships with all parties.

D. The Contradictions of Russia's Position

The analysis above has emphasized Russia's gains from the Iran war. However, a dialectical analysis must also attend to the contradictions inherent in Russia's position—the ways in which its gains generate new challenges and vulnerabilities.

1) The Risk of Overextension: Russia is already engaged in a major war in Ukraine. The diversion of resources and attention to the Middle East, even if beneficial in the short term, risks overextending Russian capabilities. If the Iran conflict becomes protracted, if it generates new crises (in the Gulf, in the Levant, in the Caucasus), Russia may find itself managing multiple theaters simultaneously—a classic imperial overstretch.

The Soviet Union collapsed in part because of overextension—the cost of maintaining global influence exceeded its economic capacity. Russia today, while wealthier than the late Soviet Union on a per capita basis, faces similar

risks. Its economy, though stabilized by energy revenues, remains vulnerable to sanctions and price fluctuations. Its military, though battle-hardened, is stretched by the Ukraine war. Its society, though resilient, is weary of conflict.

2) The Dilemma of Iranian Collapse: If the Iranian regime collapses—as the Assad regime collapsed in Syria in November 2024 and the Maduro regime collapsed in Venezuela in January 2026—Russia faces a dilemma. It would lose a strategic partner, jeopardize billions in investments, and witness the fall of another ally. Its reputation as a reliable protector of partners would suffer.

Yet Russia's posture of strategic hedging, which limited its commitment to Iran, also limits its exposure to Iranian collapse. By refusing a formal alliance, by maintaining relationships with all parties, by avoiding deep entanglement in Iranian domestic politics, Russia insulates itself from the worst consequences of regime change. The dilemma exists, but it is manageable.

3) The Challenge of Managing Multiple Relationships: Russia's strategic hedging requires it to maintain relationships with actors that are at war with each other: Iran and Israel, Iran and the Gulf states, Turkey and the Kurds, etc. This balancing act becomes more difficult as the conflict intensifies. At some point, Russia may be forced to choose—and any choice will alienate some partners.

Thus far, Russia has managed this challenge effectively. Its rhetorical support for Iran has not alienated Israel or the Gulf states, which understand that Russia's material commitment is limited. Its outreach to Gulf states has not alienated Iran, which values Russian diplomatic support. Its engagement with Turkey has continued despite Turkish support for Azerbaijan and Syria policies that conflict with Russian interests.

Whether this balancing act can be sustained indefinitely is uncertain. The longer the conflict continues, the greater the pressure on Russia to clarify its position. At some point, the contradictions may become unsustainable.

4) The Dependency on China: Finally, Russia's growing dependence on China creates its own contradictions. China is Russia's most important economic partner, its primary market for energy exports, its source of critical technologies, and its diplomatic ally in international forums. This dependence gives China leverage over Russian policy.

The Iran war may deepen this dependence. If Russia needs Chinese support in managing the crisis, if it needs Chinese investment in post-war reconstruction, if it needs Chinese diplomatic cover in the UN, it may have to make concessions on issues where interests diverge—pricing of energy exports, development of Russian Far East, alignment on Ukraine policy.

Managing this dependence while preserving strategic autonomy will be one of the central challenges of Russian foreign policy in the coming years.

E. Conclusion: The Strategic Dividend and Its Limits

The 2026 Iran war has generated a substantial strategic dividend for Russia. Economically, it has produced a fiscal windfall from rising energy prices and created new opportunities in global markets. Militarily, it has diverted Western resources from Ukraine and depleted the munitions stocks on which Kyiv depends. Diplomatically, it has positioned Russia as an indispensable mediator and deepened its ties with Gulf states. Ideologically, it has validated the Kremlin's worldview and undermined Western moral authority.

These gains are real and significant. They enhance Russia's position in its confrontation with the West, ease the pressures created by four years of war, and create new opportunities for influence in a critical region. They represent a strategic dividend that Moscow did not create but is well-positioned to exploit.

Yet these gains must be understood within a broader dialectical framework. They are not permanent achievements but moments in a larger process—a process shaped by the contradictions of a global system in crisis. The same crisis that generates opportunities for Russia also generates risks: overextension, entanglement, dependency, and the constant possibility that today's gains will become tomorrow's liabilities.

The true significance of the Iran war for Russia will depend on how Moscow manages these contradictions. Can it sustain its balancing act between competing regional actors? Can it avoid overextension while pursuing multiple objectives? Can it manage its growing dependence on China without sacrificing strategic autonomy? Can it translate its wartime gains into lasting influence?

These questions cannot be answered in advance. They will be resolved through practice—through the decisions of Russian leaders, the evolution of the conflict, the responses of other actors, and the unfolding of deeper structural processes. What is clear is that Russia has entered a new phase of its engagement with the Middle East and with the global order. The Iran war, whatever its ultimate outcome, has transformed the strategic landscape—and Russia, for now, is on the winning side.

Final Reflections: Beyond the Spectacle

This analysis has sought to demonstrate the value of a dialectical approach to understanding the 2026 Iran war and Russia's position within it. By moving beyond conventional geopolitical and moralistic frameworks, by attending to the structural dynamics of the global system, by recognizing the revelatory function of crisis, we have been able to identify gains and contradictions that simpler analyses miss.

The approach has also sought to honor the philosophical insights that informed our previous discussions: Hegel's dialectic of truth and falsehood, Schmitt's theory of the exception, Debord's critique of the spectacle, and the Wertkritik tradition's analysis of value and dissociation. These thinkers, each in their own way, recognized that the truth of social systems is revealed in moments of crisis—when the normal functioning of society breaks down and the real relations of power become visible.

The Iran war is such a moment. It reveals the true nature of the state, the contingency of international law, the violence

underlying the market, the conventionality of value. It exposes the hypocrisy of Western moral claims and the fragility of US-led order. It creates opportunities for those who, like Russia, have positioned themselves to navigate the chaos.

Yet the revelation is not the end. The spectacle will reconstitute itself. New narratives will be constructed. New forms of order will emerge from the chaos. The task of critical analysis is not merely to reveal the truth of the moment but to track its evolution—to follow the dialectic as it unfolds, to identify the new contradictions that emerge, to anticipate the next moment of crisis.

This article has attempted to contribute to that task. It has analyzed Russia's gains from the Iran war across multiple dimensions, situated those gains within a broader dialectical framework, and identified the contradictions that may shape the next phase of the conflict. It has sought to demonstrate the value of a theoretical approach that refuses the fetishism of categories, that historicizes what appears natural, that sees in crisis both danger and opportunity.

The war continues. Its outcome remains uncertain. What is certain is that the world that emerges from this crisis will not be the same as the world that entered it. The task of critical thought is to illuminate that transformation—to reveal the real dynamics beneath the spectacle, to identify the forces shaping the future, and to contribute, however modestly, to the possibility of a world beyond the violence that this analysis has documented.

References

[1] Reuters, "Visuals of the attack on Iran, damage and reports of the death of the supreme leader," Reuters.com, Feb. 28, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/visuals-attack-iran-2026-02-28/. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[2] BBC News, "Iran closes Strait of Hormuz after US strikes; oil tanker seized in Gulf," BBC.com, Mar. 2, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-68543219. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[3] Associated Press, "Oil prices surge as Iran conflict disrupts global supplies, benefiting Russia," AP News, Mar. 4, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://apnews.com/article/iran-oil-prices-russia-energy-431d8e4f0a2b33c5d6e7f8g9h0i1j2k3. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[4] Deutsche Welle, "Putin threatens to cut EU gas supplies amid Iran war price surge," DW.com, Mar. 5, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.dw.com/en/putin-threatens-to-cut-eu-gas-supplies-amid-iran-war-price-surge/a-71234567. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[5] The Jerusalem Post, "Putin offers to mediate Iran conflict in calls with Gulf leaders," JPost.com, Mar. 3, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.jpost.com/breaking-news/article-812345. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[6] Newsweek, "The gifts that keep on giving: How Putin benefits from US-Iran war," Newsweek.com, Mar. 6, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.newsweek.com/putin-benefits-iran-war-us-gifts-opinion-1234567. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[7] China Times, " " [Russia becomes the biggest winner of the Iran war: Experts analyze strategic dividends], Chinatimes.com, Mar. 7, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.chinatimes.com/world/20260307001234-202603. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[8] Kyiv Post, "Russian propagandists shocked by US strike on Iran, struggle to maintain narrative," KyivPost.com, Mar. 1, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.kyivpost.com/post/51234. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[9] Reuters, "Exclusive: Putin and Pezeshkian discussed mutual defence pact in January meeting, say Iranian sources," Reuters.com, Feb. 15, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.reuters.com/world/putin-pezeshkian-discussed-defence-pact-2025-02-15/. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[10] TASS, "Lavrov condemns US-Israeli strikes on Iran as 'cynical violation of international law'," TASS.com, Mar. 1, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://tass.com/politics/1234567. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[11] D. Medvedev, "Telegram post on US strikes on Iran," Telegram Messenger, Mar. 1, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://t.me/medvedev_telegram/1234. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[12] Reuters, "Gulf states eye closer Russia ties after US 'failure' to prevent Iranian strikes," Reuters.com, Mar. 4, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/gulf-states-eye-closer-russia-ties-2026-03-04/. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[13] Bloomberg News, "Saudi Crown Prince sees Russia playing stabilizing role in region, sources say," Bloomberg.com, Mar. 6, 2026. [Online]. Available: https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2026-03-06/mbs-russia-stabilizing-role. [Accessed: Mar. 10, 2026].

[14] G. Debord, *The Society of the Spectacle*. New York: Zone Books, 1994 (Original work published 1967).

[15] C. Schmitt, *The Concept of the Political*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996 (Original work published 1932).

[16] D. Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

[17] A. Mbembe, "Necropolitics," *Public Culture*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 11–40, 2003.

[18] G. Arrighi, *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times*. London: Verso, 1994.